



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,112	08/28/2001	Uwe Feuchter	10191/1827	5096

26646 7590 03/15/2004

KENYON & KENYON  
ONE BROADWAY  
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

BANGACHON, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2635

7

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,112

Applicant(s)

FEUCHTER ET AL.

Examiner

William Bangachon

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Examiner's Response*

1. In response to the application filed 8/28/01, the application has been examined. The Examiner has considered the presentation of claims in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. It is the Examiner's position that claims 9-16 are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this Office action:

### *Specification*

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc. In this case, **the abstract recites "The present invention..."**

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "*electronically codable recognition device* fixed to the vehicle" must be shown or the feature(s)

Art Unit: 2635

canceled from the claim(s) (see sub spec, page 8, lines 9-12). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 9-11, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,400,254 (Yamamoto et al).

In claim 9, a driving authorization system for a motor vehicle, the driving authorization system comprising:

an electronically codable recognition device (24) fixed to the vehicle and including a receiving device (40) that forms a receiving region {paragraph bridging cols. 3 and 4};

a corresponding external electronic enabling device (60) insertable into the recognition device, and in the receiving region (44) being forceable from one position into another position, in which an elastic restoring force is applicable for returning the corresponding external electronic enabling device in a direction of the one position, the corresponding external electronic enabling device being forceable in a releasable and lockable manner into the one position in the receiving region {col. 3, lines 42-65};

at least one vehicle-specific device (25, 30, 32) being enabling in response to the corresponding external electronic enabling device and being recognizable by the electronically codable recognition device {col. 4, lines 50-63};

an actuating device (98) in the receiving region for triggering by the corresponding external electronic enabling device, and for detecting the corresponding external electronic enabling device in the one position and the another position, and for triggering a corresponding ignition-lock function {col. 6, lines 22-35; col. 7, lines 10-26}; and

a separately releasable locking mechanism for locking the corresponding external electronic enabling device in the one position {col. 6, lines 52-67; col. 7, lines 30-35}.

Yamamoto does not disclose expressly "an elastic restoring force applicable for returning the corresponding external electronic enabling device in a direction of the one position". However, the rotary switch of Yamamoto has a PUSH/LOCK position. So that when the operating knob (40) is pushed and then turned right, its position changes to that for turning accessories on (ACC) {col. 3, lines 58-65}. Obviously, there is an elastic restoring force in the system of Yamamoto to not allow the operating knob to turn right (LOCK position). And a broad interpretation of the claim would be analogous to the same features of the rotary switch of Yamamoto. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have "an elastic restoring force applicable for returning the corresponding external electronic enabling device in a direction of the one position" in the system of Yamamoto, as claimed, because the elastic restoring force sets the operating knob in the LOCK position.

Art Unit: 2635

In claim 10, the driving authorization system of claim 9, wherein (please refer to figure 2):

the corresponding ignition-lock function is an ignition-on-function (IG/ON) for the one position; and

the corresponding ignition-lock function is the engine-start-function (START) for the another position. See col. 3, lines 62-65.

In claim 11, the driving authorization system of claim 9, wherein:

the corresponding external electronic enabling device is forceable in a releasable and lockable manner into one other position that is detectable by the actuating device {col. 3, lines 28-35, lines 58-62}; and

the actuating device triggers at least one of an ignition-neutral-function and another corresponding ignition-lock function {col. 3, lines 56-65}.

In claim 13, the driving authorization system of claim 9, wherein the corresponding external electronic enabling device is a smart card insertable through a slit into the receiving region {col. 3, lines 43-55}.

In claim 16, the driving authorization system of claim 11, wherein the actuating device, in one of the one position, the another position and the one other position, triggers a communication between the corresponding external electronic enabling

device and the electronically codable recognition device {paragraph bridging cols. 4 and 5; col. 5, lines 30-35}.

8. Claims 12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,400,254 (Yamamoto et al) in view of US 4,149,394 (Sornes).

In claim 12, Yamamoto does not disclose expressly "the driving authorization system of claim 9, wherein the receiving region includes an elastic locking pin device for interacting with at least one notch in the corresponding external electronic enabling device for releasably locking the corresponding external electronic enabling device in the one position." Sornes, in the same field of endeavor (key and lock), teach of a key and lock system including an elastic locking pin device, as claimed {Sornes, figures 3-6; col. 2, line 58-col. 3, line 22}. Sornes suggests that said features of a key and lock system is desirable because it provides means to change the combination of the lock to a new key for security reasons and in case the key for the lock is lost {Sornes, col. 1, lines 18-23}. Obviously, these features are desirable in the system of Yamamoto. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a receiving region that includes an elastic locking pin device, as claimed, in the system of Yamamoto, because it provides means to change the combination of the lock to a new key for security reasons and in case the key for the lock is lost, as taught by Sornes.



In claim 14, the driving authorization system of claim 11, wherein the actuating device includes at least one of one mechanical position sensor and at least one optical position sensor for detecting the corresponding external electronic enabling device in one of the one position, the another position and the one other position {Sornes, figures 3-6; col. 2, line 58-col. 3, line 22}.

In claim 15, the driving authorization system of claim 9, further comprising a spring device for returning the corresponding external electronic enabling device to the one position in response to the pressure no longer being applied, the one other position being reachable by applying pressure to the corresponding external electronic enabling device from the one position until a stop is reached {Sornes, col. 2, line 48-col. 3, line 22}.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 4517746 (Easley) is cited in that it teaches of a method and apparatus for decoding wafer combination {see whole document}.

### ***Examiner Contact Information***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bangachon whose telephone number is 703-305-2701. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/4/10.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 703-305-4704. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314 for regular and After Final formal communications. The examiner's fax number is 703-746-6071 for informal communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

William L Bangachon  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2635

February 24, 2004

MICHAEL HORABIK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

